

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated October 6, 2003, claims 1, 7, 9, 16, 18, 19, 25, 27, 28 and 33 have been amended. Claims 1-34 remain in the case. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

The Office Action rejected claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Examiner stated that the recitation of the phrase "web page/groupwise" in line 9 lacks support in the specification for its use.

In response, the Applicant has replaced the phrase "web page/groupwise" with the new phrase "web page" to overcome this rejection.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-34 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Melen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,263,121).

The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection based on the amendments to the claims and the arguments below.

Claims 1, 9, 18 and 27 recite in part a system, method or computer readable medium "...for efficient information storage and retrieval of information..." that includes "...recommending topic matters that are related to the information being captured during retrieval of the information..."

In contrast, Melen et al. disclose a "[S]ystem and method for archiving and retrieving documents based on attributes of the document... The attributes may be particular words, word locations, font sizes, or other properties that can be located by a computer processor." Although Melen et al. disclose "...that master list 150 is further comprised of a document attribute map 220..." and the "...document attribute map 220 contains a list of attributes for each document category, clearly, **nowhere** does Melen et al. disclose recommending topic matters that are related to the information being captured during retrieval of the information, like the Applicant's claimed invention. Since Melen et al. do **not** disclose all of the Applicant's features of either claims 1, 9, 18 or 27, Melen et al. cannot anticipate either claim. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). MPEP 2131.

With regard to the dependent claims, because they depend from the above-argued respective independent claims, and they contain additional limitations that are patentably distinguishable over the cited references, these claims are also considered

to be patentable (MPEP § 2143.03).

Thus, it is respectfully requested that all of the claims be allowed based on the amendments and arguments. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. Additionally, in an effort to further the prosecution of the subject application, the Applicant kindly invites the Examiner to telephone the Applicant's attorney at (818) 885-1575 if the Examiner has any questions or concerns. Please note that all correspondence should continue to be directed to:

Hewlett Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,
Dated: January 5, 2004



Edmond A. DeFrank
Reg. No. 37,814
Attorney for Applicants
(818) 885-1575 TEL
(818) 885-5750 FAX